



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

To one who still believes in the Dorians, the book bristles with challenges. In spite of the efforts of Poulsen and other adherents of the "Bauernstil" theory, the gap between the primitive incised geometric and the later geometric vases is great, and Poulsen's "eupatridischer Adel" seems an even more shadowy band than the much-abused Dorians. Nevertheless, although one may not agree with its main thesis, the book is full of suggestion, and marks a distinct advance in the study of the geometric style in general and the Dipylon vases in particular.

GEORGE H. CHASE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

---

*Four Plays of Euripides.* By A. W. VERRALL. London: Macmillan & Co., 1905. Pp. xii + 292. \$2.25.

We are tempted to construct our review of Mr. Verrall's *Four Plays of Euripides* by an application of his method to himself. In his essay on the *Helena*, for example, Mr. Verrall proves that the *Helena* could not have been originally written for the Attic stage. It was composed for private recitation at the villa, on the island of Makronisi, of a maiden lady friend of the poet. Mr. Verrall can name the occasion—the festival of the Thesmophoria, and the lady, Eido, orphan daughter of Proteas, a worthy apothecary. She has reached the parlor-reading and women's-club age, for her locks are touched with gray. How easy and how delightful, by the exercise of a tenth portion of Mr. Verrall's divinatory *Kombinationsgabe*, to show that his essay on the *Helena* cannot possibly have been intended for musty-fusty philologists, but was originally read in a London drawing-room in emulation of Dr. Reich's *geistreiche* Platonic lectures.

Similarly of the *Herakles*. Euripides could not have believed in the legend of Herakles. Therefore the hero does not, cannot, go mad in the course of the drama. He has always been mad. He did not rescue Theseus from Hades, but merely from some coal-pit or subterranean robbers' den. His last injunction about the ἀθλίον κυνός (l. 1386 unamended) does not mean Cerberus. It is a reference to an anonymous pup "which Herakles was bringing from Laconia to Eurystheus" and had inadvertently left at a way station. We are not informed whether he had "eat his tag." Mr. Verrall, with a sympathy for animals as touching as that which he attributes to Herakles and Euripides, reminds us that such a dog "would, if left on the road, be exceedingly unhappy." Now by parity of reasoning—but no! we forbear to apply our method to Mr. Verrall in this instance; that way madness lies.

It would be naïve, then, to take Mr. Verrall too seriously. Yet if he chooses to employ his wit and ingenuity in this way, we may be grateful

or a book that supplies an hour or two of pleasant reading and sends us back to Euripides with renewed zest. Mr. Verrall's guiding principle is that Euripides, being a great poet, cannot possibly be guilty of the artistic sins which sober criticism discovers in his plays. If, dealing with legendary matter, he destroys the unity of poetic feeling by skeptical innuendo, it must be in the propagation of some deep and consistent philosophy of enlightenment. If he seems to play fast and loose with the unity of time, and puts irrelevant rhetorical tirades into the mouths of his characters, it is not sufficiently explained by the fact that, in Jebb's words, "the genius of Euripides was at discord with the form in which he worked." The perturbations in his artistic orbit are too great for that. They must be accounted for by some cause external to the drama, some consistent inner design apparent only to the initiated, some underplot which ingenuity may detect. These things Mr. Verrall undertakes to reveal to us. Thus in the *Andromache*, to waive other inconsistencies in the plot, we cannot suppose, he argues, that one choric song, and the short scene of Peleus' return, are intended to cover the time of Orestes' journey to Delphi, the murder of Neoptolemus, and the home-bringing of the body. Things are not what they seem or what Euripides explicitly says they are. In reality Menelaus and Orestes have been in collusion from the start to get rid of Neoptolemus and frighten Hermione into eloping with Orestes, thereby in the eyes of the world sharing his guilt.

Space fails to set forth the plot worked out for the *Orestes*, which Mr. Verrall describes as a study in the psychology of despair. In his rendering it is as good as a Zola novel—say *Thérèse Raquin*. It is, of course, impossible to accept all his interpretations. He denies, for example, that the frightened Phrygian is a comic personage, though he is obviously of the same quality as his fellow in *Timotheus*. But the study as a whole is replete with interesting suggestions, and will at least make the play very much more real to the average reader.

There is, however, one grave objection to this fantastic scholarship. It betrays its votaries into mistranslation and misinterpretation of the texts. With regard to the plots and purposes of Euripides opinion is as free as it is in respect to the Homeric question or the dates of the Platonic dialogues. But Mr. Verrall only weakens his case when he asks us to accept renderings which a scholar of his competence could not possibly propose except under the obsession of a theory. Herakles himself in his lucid intervals would have refused to believe that in

τάς θ' αἵματώπους θεὰς ὀνειδίζων ἐμοί

ἐμοί is necessarily emphatic and means "to such a hardened skeptic as I am, impervious to vulgar superstitions," or that in

ἦ καὶ πρόσω γὰρ τῶν ἐμῶν ψαύσεις κακῶν;

πρόσω means "at the farthest distance," i. e., "however little to the purpose," or that the second line of

οὐδεὶς γυναικὸς φάρμακ' ἐξηγήρῃκέ πω  
κακῆς· τοσοῦτόν ἐσμεν ἀνθρώποις κακόν.

is to be translated "when she is evil; so far and so far only are we an evil to mankind." A writer who takes these liberties with his readers cannot complain if his reviewers emancipate themselves a little too.

PAUL SHOREY

*De Romanorum iuris publici sacrique vocabulis solemnibus in Graecum sermonem conversis.* Scripsit DAVID MAGIE.  
Leipzig: Teubner, 1905. Pp. 183. M. 6.

The larger portion of this treatise, which emanates from the school of Professor Wissowa, consists of a practically exhaustive tabular list (pp. 43-154) of the Greek expressions used, from the beginning of the second century B.C. to the reign of Diocletian, to represent the Latin official terminology, with full references to writers, inscriptions, and papyri. Extensive Greek and Latin indices follow (pp. 155-83). The list and the indices, admirable in arrangement and typography, constitute in themselves an indispensable aid to the student of Roman political, military, and religious institutions, and will be especially useful in connection with the study of the papyri and of the inscriptions now appearing in *IGR.* under the editorship of Cagnat (see *Class. Phil.* I, p. 193).

The first part of the treatise is a discussion of the origin of the equivalent Greek expressions according to the principles followed in framing them. The author distinguishes three methods, comparison (e. g., *aedilis*=ἀγορανόμος), translation (e. g., *censor*=τιμητής), and transcription (e. g., ὑπεράτωρ, πραιπόσιτος). Some few terms which have the appearance of being translations are found to belong rather to the first category, since they represent analogous functions in Greek states which were in close contact with the Romans, e. g., Neapolitan δῆμαρχος = *tribunus populi*. Apart from such words, the origin of which is not always certain, the classification is satisfactory and leads the author to useful generalizations (pp. 23, 33, 41) as to the time of origin and the sphere of application of each method. An additional chapter on hybrid formations and irregular inflections would have been useful, and also an explanation of the principles to be followed as regards accentuation. The reason is not obvious for such variations as βιγουλὸί and οὐίγουλαι on p. 136, κανδίδατος, p. 96 (*IGR.* I. 134, -άτος) and δεποσάτος, p. 129, and σίνγλαρις and σινγυλάρις, p. 137 (cf. *IGR.* III. 394, σινγλάρης). I have noted the omission of few terms that are found in Van Herwerden and in *IGR.*; but σεβαστοφάντης and ἀπαβοκαός should be added from *IGR.* III. 225. The Latin is fluent and clear. On p. 10, n. 5, read *appellatio*.

EDWARD CAPPS